

DELAWARE RE-ENTRY EDUCATION TASK FORCE

August 27, 2014

9:30 a.m.

**Haslet Armory (Conference Room 219), 122 Martin Luther
King Jr. Blvd. South, Dover, DE**

MEETING MINUTES

Task Force members in attendance:

Ed Atwood, Justice of the Peace Court
Joanna Champney, Delaware Center for Justice
Kimberly H. Chandler, Dept. of Safety and Homeland Security
Nancy Dietz, Dept. of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families
Eliza Hirst on behalf of Tania Culley, Office of the Child Advocate
Frederika Jenner, Delaware State Education Association
The Honorable Chandlee Johnson Kuhn, Family Court, New Castle County Courthouse
Abdul-Malik Muhammad, Parkway Academy Schools
The Honorable Jennifer Ranji (Chair), Dept. of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families
Erik Raser-Schramm, Citizen Representative
John Sadowski on behalf of The Honorable Mark T. Murphy, Dept. of Education
Laurisa Schutt, Teach for America – Delaware
Kim Siegel on behalf of The Honorable Matthew Denn, Lieutenant Governor's Office
Sybil White on behalf of Wendy Strauss, Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens
Dory Zatuchni, Jewish Family Services of Delaware

Others in attendance:

Michelle, Student
Aisha Davis, Delaware Family Court
David Emenheiser, US Department of Education
Alicia Kendorski, Dept. of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families
Albert Rowe, Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens
Cara Sawyer, Dept. of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families
Kelly Schaffer, Dept. of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families (consultant)
David Wilford, Dept. of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families

1. Welcome and Introductions

Secretary Ranji welcomed everyone to the meeting. Next, the minutes from the July 30th Task Force meeting were reviewed. John Sadowski requested the minutes on page 4, second paragraph, be amended to say, "Ms. Porter reviewed data that indicated the total number of youth served by YRS programs disaggregated by school districts" (as opposed to stating "the districts

from which students are coming”). He also requested that “of kids being sent by each district” be amended to state “of each district’s total student enrollment that are placed in YRS programs by the juvenile justice system.” Mr. Sadowski noted the way the minutes currently read makes it sound as though youth are sent to YRS by school districts. The minutes were approved with the amendments noted.

2. Re-Entry from the Youth Perspective

Secretary Ranji stated the Task Force is interested in hearing from students who can share their perspective about re-entry. We will hear from a student today, Michelle, who will talk about her experience, challenges and concerns. This is an opportunity for her to share what she has been through as a result of her transition.

Alicia Kendorski from YRS provided background information on Michelle’s pathway. Michelle was placed on probation in June 2012. She had some issues being compliant with probation and was in and out of Dover Behavioral Health inpatient and day treatment. Being non-compliant with her placement then led her to be placed at Coastal Harbor in Savannah, Georgia. She was there for 208 days, and had some issues that prolonged her stay. Ultimately Michelle was successfully discharged. She returned to Delaware to live with her mother, mother’s boyfriend and younger brother. She then went to Dover Behavioral Health day treatment successfully and transitioned back into her regular high school.

Next, Michelle spoke about challenges going back to school. She stated it was a bigger environment with a lot more kids than she was used to. She also didn’t know where her classes were when she first got there. Michelle then shared that her supports were her probation officer, her parents and behavioral health workers. When in school, she was also allowed to walk out of class and talk with someone when she needed to. This was her “hot pass.” Michelle stated her

goal is to finish high school, go to college and become a nurse. The classes she took were smaller and through the ILC, intensive learning center. She also stated that when she completed behavioral health she was able to get her ankle bracelet off for when she returned back to school.

Secretary Ranji confirmed Michelle's school is Sussex Central. She started back sophomore year in September of last year. Secretary Ranji asked how she did this year. Michelle responded she did a lot better than she thought she would. She wasn't used to being in a big environment. In Georgia it was a smaller environment and separate classes. Secretary Ranji asked if she had been to Sussex Central before, and Michelle responded no. Before Georgia she was at Georgetown Middle School. Secretary Ranji summarized that Michelle went to Georgia for placement and when she returned she went directly to Sussex Central. Ms. Kendorski stated she advocated for Michelle to have the ILC setting, which she thought appropriate for her. She also stated Michelle had all passing classes this year except for gym. Secretary Ranji asked Ms. Kendorski to describe the ILC program. Ms. Kendorski stated it is a smaller setting with special accommodations, smaller classroom sizes, and additional supports. Some students have someone follow them from class to class to get where they need to be. For Michelle, they gave her a "hot pass" to take a break and go to the guidance counselor. Ms. Kendorski stated the smaller setting helped Michelle learn better. Secretary Ranji asked Michelle if she is going back to school next week. Michelle responded yes and she is nervous about her return to school.

Secretary Ranji stated the Task Force heard from a student last month who hadn't transitioned yet, and this time we heard from someone who returned successfully to school. Michelle used her hot pass, had assistance getting into the ILC setting and has a number of people for support. Those types of supports are important for the success of kids transitioning.

A Task Force member asked Michelle if she had the opportunity to talk with her family or other supports during her time in Georgia. Michelle responded she was able to talk to family every night and that she found that helpful. Ms. Kendorski stated the program flies families out and pays for gas or hotels so they can visit while their child is going through treatment.

Nancy Dietz asked if there were any issues with transferring credits from Georgia to Sussex Central. Ms. Kendorski stated she didn't hear of any issues. Mr. Sadowski stated schools often get course descriptions from the programs and try to match up credits. This allows students to gain credits and not lose ground.

Secretary Ranji thanked Michelle for coming to speak with the Task Force.

3. Data Report Outs from June Meeting

Before summarizing report outs, Secretary Ranji provided an update on the Promising Models summary. She stated Cara and Kelly are reaching out to other states and jurisdictions to gather information. We wanted to keep updating this document to share as we learn about programs and opportunities in other states. The document is a work in progress. As we have more conversations we are seeing things fall into categories and we will look at how to reorganize the information accordingly. One category is the type of school setting, for example something other than the traditional school setting. The second category is educating and supporting kids to re-enter a traditional school setting. A lot of states have invested in educating probation officers and staff to create a group of people who will understand youth's needs. The next category is supports, for example, investing in someone in the school such as a transition specialist. This may be someone who knows the juvenile justice system and can bridge the gap. A final piece is clarity around roles and decision-making. Virginia has adopted regulations that set forth criteria about how it is determined where the student returns. This helps everyone

understand the expectations. The last category in the document is best practice recommendations. We've spoken to a couple people to bring in as speakers who know the landscape and have laid out what they've seen and what we should prioritize. There are some different ideas – for example, investing in a new school or supports for traditional school settings, or both.

Next, Secretary Ranji provided the report outs. One of the pieces of information we were asked to obtain from last meeting was the percentage of district's total population that is in secure care at YRS. She stated we looked at the data and it is not terribly surprising. The district having the highest percentage of youth who are in secure care at YRS is Christina. Capital and Laurel were 3.1%, followed by Brandywine, Colonial and Milford. This is consistent with some of the discussions we had about the numbers of youth.

The second report out is about district run alternatives. Secretary Ranji stated that at the last meeting, according to data Ms. Porter presented, it looked like a bulk of kids going to alternative schools were going to district run schools. After the last meeting we spoke with John Sadowski and gathered information to clarify. Secretary Ranji stated we learned there are four district-run alternatives – Colonial, Brandywine, Christina and Indian River. Brandywine runs Brandywine Community School and contracts services out with A Friend of the Family. Christina has the Douglass School, Colonial has the Wallin School, and Indian River has the Carver Center. On the school's website Douglass School's enrollment is 191 and Wallin School's says 128 for enrollment. Secretary Ranji stated we don't have a lot of information about the schools. There doesn't seem to be easily accessible data on suspension, expulsion and enrollment for district-run alternative schools. We thought about reaching out to districts, but think it makes more sense to see whether the Task Force thinks it would be valuable to have a roundtable with the districts.

Secretary Ranji suggested we have district representatives come meet with the Task Force, providing an opportunity to ask questions and for districts to talk about how they decide where transitioning youth return to school. A Task Force member raised a question asked about not having outcome information from district run alternatives. John Sadowski said the state tracks CDAP programs, but districts track their locally funded schools. That is data we would need to get from districts. That level of information is gathered from charters but not alternatives.

Secretary Ranji stated she suspects what's happening is the information about students attending the alternative programs may be counted district wide, and schools may not be breaking data out for the alternative school. A question was raised about whether data exists for state run alternatives. Mr. Sadowski stated yes, the state has DCAS scores. Those scores go back to the home district. We would have to look at individual students to see when they were at the alternative program and for how long. Secretary Ranji stated data is not captured in a way that allows us to look at students in the alternative programs. A question was raised about there being nothing to measure the effective delivery of education at the district run alternatives. Mr. Sadowski responded the state does not have a way to measure. A follow up question was raised about continuity of services provided to youth in alternative programs. Secretary Ranji stated we have not seen this data. She stated at the last meeting we were getting state run information and it wasn't syncing with the data Ms. Porter reported. Mr. Sadowski stated he needs to connect with Ms. Porter to look at data on an individual student basis. Some students might have special education needs and be going to ILC. Secretary Ranji stated districts might have that information. Mr. Muhammad said one district is missing from the list of district run alternatives, Red Clay for elementary and middle school students – the Positive Change program. Providence runs the program. Though it serves elementary and middle school students we could consider it

a fifth school. Providence is also stepping in to run Douglass. Christina will no longer be the direct provider. Two out of the five district-run alternatives will be run by Providence. A Task Force member asked why the change was made. Mr. Muhammad stated he couldn't speak to their motivating factors. He then stated Providence has internally decided to track the same outcomes required on the state DOE report, including change in academic performance, pre and during the program and DCAS. He also noted they don't always have students for a full DCAS window and that is the nature of the alternative school placement. He stated they also look at behavior measured by out of school suspension. They measure behavioral health and mental health outcomes by assessments and anecdotal progress from counselors. This is the same data they will capture for district-based alternatives. A question was raised about whether the data is based on IEPs established. Mr. Sadowski stated it is ISPs – individualized service plan. Not all students are special education, and a majority are regular education. Mr. Muhammad stated 100 percent have an ISP and some have an IEP where relevant. 32-35 percent are identified as special education.

Secretary Ranji asked if the group is comfortable with inviting districts for a roundtable discussion. The issue of not knowing when a student comes or how long they'll be in a program makes it challenging. She stated one of the district run alternatives had suspension and expulsion information on the DOE website, but it wasn't clear if it was for students before they arrived or related to that specific school. The unpredictable nature of youth attending alternative schools makes it more challenging. Mr. Muhammad responded that inviting districts to the table would be helpful. They can also answer questions about decisions for placement. Secretary Ranji stated we would invite the district run alternatives.

A Task Force member asked to clarify Parkway is owned by Providence and asked who made the decision for Providence to take responsibility for the alternative schools. Mr. Sadowski stated the consortium decides if they want one of the districts to run the school. For Kent and New Castle it is in statute that they can contract out services if they choose to do so. It goes out to RFP, organizations respond, responses are evaluated and the contract is awarded. A follow up question was asked about whether districts pool resources. Mr. Sadowski responded yes. A Task Force member requested a spreadsheet be developed showing summary information about alternative schools. Mr. Muhammad stated Providence has the first, second, third and fourth highest ranking outcomes for alternative schools. 90 percent of students transition back to their traditional school and remain there. Recidivism means not returning to the alternative school. He stated Christina made the decision to go to RFP to contract out services to run the Douglass program and he does not know why the decision was made to go to RFP. It could be about outcomes. Providence was awarded the contract.

Judge Kuhn stated before we meet with districts we need to understand what all the alternative schools are, what their numbers are, how long students are there and what the criteria are for who goes there. One of the things we will learn is we are not comparing apples to apples. She stated the Brandywine program is an incredibly special place run with academic credibility and care; but questioned if it is an alternative school or an in-school suspension. It is outside the regular school, in a different building. Some people refer to it as an alternative school and others count it as an in school suspension that doesn't count as suspension. It is important to understand what each program is, who refers for what purposes and for how long students attend. Secretary Ranji stated we could put together a list of the 3 county run, and 5 district alternatives showing what we know so far. If we talk individually to each district then it's going to continue

to be apples to oranges. Rather than try to gather information via individual conversations she suggested we bring them in and give a list of questions in advance so they understand what the Task Force wants to hear. They will have an opportunity all together to describe whom they serve, how they decide where students are placed and explain their numbers. The group can also discuss why numbers may look different. Secretary Ranji summarized the Department will move forward with planning the roundtable and will reach out to districts to participate at the September meeting. A question was raised about what we are looking at for referrals. Mr. Sadowski responded students live in a district, but the only way to get to YRS is through the court and not through referrals from a district.

4. David Emenheiser, Ed.D. Education Program Specialist, US Department of Education

Secretary Ranji stated the Department has been thinking about guest speakers to invite to speak with the group. One of the items she introduced at the last meeting was about US Departments of Justice and Education's work together. Since then we did outreach to learn more about re-entry and educational aspects of the Departments' work, and Secretary Ranji noted she is happy to have David Emenheiser to speak with the group today.

Dr. Emenheiser presented to the group. He stated it is interesting to see Delaware and hear the conversations taking place. The issues the Task Force is talking about are the issues being faced by youth. He stated the group would hear themes throughout the presentation. Dr. Emenheiser stated 34% of youth who are justice involved have an identified disability. This is 3-4 times the average for non-adjudicated youth. If we want to make a move toward making re-entry better, we have to look at kids with disabilities and their unique needs. The other issue is when they return they recidivate faster and more frequently than their non-disabled peers. Judge Kuhn asked if these are identified disabilities. Dr. Emenheiser responded yes. A follow up

question was raised about whether there may be more, because many youth in the justice system have yet to be identified as special education. Dr. Emenheiser responded yes, and stated unmet educational needs lead to behaviors. There is a higher educational need among even those not identified. A question was raised about whether the students qualify for IEPs and are not necessarily served by 504. Dr. Emenheiser stated it is specifically IEPs. Some students could be served by 504 and not counted here.

Dr. Emenheiser stated that in 2012 US ED decided to compete for model demonstration projects to look at models to address re-entry to education, employment and community. The Department was broad in definitions. A facility can be almost anything, including secure long term. Youth can be anybody over the age of 12 or 7th grade. The upper limit is age 18, unless state law allows for it to be continued. He stated they also wanted this to be juvenile justice involved youth. Once youth becomes 18 they don't qualify under juvenile justice anymore, which is why they put a clause in saying 7-12th grade. Next, Mr. Emenhesier talked about what the models would address – youth outcomes, reducing recidivism and support for successful transition as measured by high school completion, postsecondary education and employment. He also noted many challenges are systems barriers. The models are required to look at what the systems changes are - for example, policies and procedures and data systems. They are also required to look at who is referring which youth and how long youth are in programs. Dr. Emenheiser stated they anticipated there might be resource allocations, including costs for transportation or personnel. The third area they need to be looking at is the costs of each component. The hope is there will be good information to share with other states. Dr. Emenheiser stated the projects were funded in January 2012. They are four-year projects, and are about half way done. The Department won't have true outcomes until 2017-18. Next, he

stated the demonstration projects were required to have at least three sites for implementation. It had to be at least three different schools from at least one LEA. The grantees also needed to partner with at least one facility that would be releasing students from that school.

Dr. Emenheiser described the demonstration project awardees - Arizona, Minnesota and Oregon. The Department received 15 eligible applications in response to the solicitation in 2012. Sarup Mathur and Heather Griller Clark from Arizona State University partnered with Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections. Arizona has one facility that releases to the state. They partnered with three high schools in the Phoenix area. The second grantee is the University of Minnesota who partnered with Boys Town, Ramsey County Community Corrections and the St. Paul Public Schools. The final grantee is Oregon Detention Services, partnering with three school districts and communities. They partnered with facilities releasing to those schools. A Task Force member asked if there were any qualified applicants from the northeast or southeast. Mr. Emenheiser responded there were applicants from New England that were close, but the Department was only able to fund three. He stated geography was not taken into consideration when looking at requests. Dr. Emenheiser continued to describe the demonstration projects, noting required components included intensive education, multidisciplinary assessments and planning and integrated transition services. He then went on to describe key features of the models. In Arizona they identified the transition specialist within a facility as key personnel. They hired additional personnel to take on much smaller caseloads. Minnesota partnered with Volunteers for America to support mentors through evidence-based practice. They work with students in a facility and also 18 months after release. Oregon has chosen to not support any additional staff, as they want the project to be sustainable. They are putting funding into

professional development at partner schools, including motivational interviewing and cognitive behavioral therapy.

Secretary Ranji asked Dr. Emenheiser if he could explain the models cited in his presentation, for instance Merging Two Worlds. Dr. Emenheiser stated Merging Two Worlds is a curriculum talking about the intra and interpersonal aspects of behavior. It sounds cognitive behavioral, how you feel about what you're doing. Expanding the Circle is Bronfenbrenner-like, and begins with internal, then talks about your closest relationships, and your circle beyond that could be extended family or teachers. It also talks about how your relationships are negotiated across those levels. Dr. Emenheiser noted the group was also e-mailed a handout that has links for much deeper information than what he is able to share today. The PowerPoint is a synthesis of information, and Task Force members can look at the resources for more information. A Task Force member acknowledged the Reintegration Toolkit from Minnesota as one of the resources, and Mr. Emenhesier stated Minnesota would be happy share information.

Next, Dr. Emenheiser summarized lessons to be learned. He noted there aren't necessarily ways to effectively address challenges, but they keep coming up. Some of the issues are education in the schools and what are the effects of that education. In many states the courts or juvenile officers are intentionally not placing youth in long term secure placements. Many are moving toward community-based or short-term placements. Other lessons to be learned have to do with record sharing and use of mentoring/case managers.

Next, Dr. Emenheiser spoke about high quality special education. The special education act requires 20 hours per week of instruction. Many facilities define the limit as 20 hours, not that 20 hours is a minimum. This can be a challenge when supporting high school completion. It is often English and math that fall into the 20 hours per week. In addition, some facilities are still

very worksheet oriented. Poor instruction may be happening on a limited basis, often for students living in a world where we are increasing high school requirements. The gap in some places between what youth can and need to earn may be widening. Dr. Emenheiser noted the young woman who spoke this morning is one academic year behind, and this may be example of the challenge being faced. Also, the law requires schools to have highly qualified teachers and personnel in all areas. This means facilities need to hire full staff plus special educators. The cost of highly qualified teachers and service providers can be a challenge. There is also friction between IEPs and FAPE (free and public education). There is a question about how FAPE can be in place when talking about under-qualified instructors. There is a lawsuit that gets at this in Contra Costa County in California. The lawsuit says secure and solitary confinement is not a reason to deny FAPE. The legal case is pending. Dr. Emenheiser next noted services aren't different in short-term care facilities. It is the service delivery that needs to be different. Families also need to be involved. Facilities need services for families to help them support their juvenile justice involved youth in the community.

The next challenge Dr. Emenheiser addressed is records sharing. This can be one of the easiest issues to address. The concern is that educational records lag behind youth adjudication. It raises a question about whether courts use records as part of the educational process, for instance do they look at whether a child has an IEP and are the records sent along with the youth. In many places, that's not what happens. Sometimes in short term placements the records don't show up until after youth leaves. This can result in loss of credits. Dr. Emenheiser acknowledged he isn't sure where Delaware is with this and asked if there are statewide graduation requirements. Mr. Sadowski stated there is a state minimum and districts are able to add additional requirements. Dr. Emenheiser asked what happens when youth end up in a

facility following a different set of requirements than the school where they are returning. It can be a significant cause for disengagement when students are not meeting requirements once they return to their district. He stated it seems like record sharing would be key way of addressing that. Mr. Sadowski asked what the process is for YRS programs to get youths records, for example finding out where the student went to school, calling the high school and getting the records. Ms. Dietz responded that transition specialists have contact with school districts to find out credit levels. Dr. Emenheiser asked if districts are allowed to share that information, because sometimes there can be issues with FERPA and it depends on how the departments are organized. Mr. Sadowski stated that when a student goes to YRS program they are dis-enrolled from their home school and are enrolled into the YRS program. Mr. Muhammad stated there is typically a representative from the outside agency who will communicate with the school to fax over a release. The slowdown varies by relationship, school and district. There are 19 school districts in Delaware. A Task Force member noted there aren't transition specialists in every district. Christina has one. Mr. Sadowski asked if YRS had access to eSchool. Secretary Ranji responded yes. The education piece is different than the treatment piece in terms of community and family connection. She stated her sense is it varies greatly depending on the district in terms of who comes to the meeting. With 19 districts plus charters, it is difficult to have a set policy and plan for when a youth goes back to their school.

Dr. Emenheiser stated the last area for learning is with the use of case managers. One concern with the projects is that services end at age 18, removing access to a mentor or case manager. There is a big challenge addressing the carryover. The Arizona model included this in their work; a mentor will continue to be funded to age 18.5. This allows six-month continuity. Within those six months adult and family services would already be in place and this would help

with some continuity. Dr. Emenheiser clarified the project period for the demonstration projects is January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2016. It is a four year project.

A Task Force member asked if there is an evaluation component and Dr. Emenheiser responded the projects are self-evaluating. The Model Demonstration Center is doing data collection and making sure data is common and clean, though the funding cycle for them ends prior to the models. He stated he is not sure if funding will be recommitted. The Department may be able to fund the models to analyze cross-cohort data. A Task Force member confirmed the information looks at first year information, and in the second and third years we should start to see some solutions. Secretary Ranji stated DOE was talking about changing foster care regulations to say if education is disrupted, and a student ends up in a school setting where despite doing what they were supposed to they cannot meet the graduation requirements for their districts, then the district can allow the student to graduate provided they meet a state minimum. This is a way to try to account for educational disruptions. If students are doing everything they can then the district can acknowledge that and allow them to graduate. There would need to be a floor for requirements. Mr. Sadowski stated he would check with Jennifer Davis for a status update. A Task Force member responded that the new regulations have been promulgated. Superintendents can waive particular graduation requirements for the district. Secretary Ranji stated we might want to look at something similar for juvenile justice.

A Task Force member asked if the sites selected for demonstration projects were more progressive than others. Dr. Emenheiser stated those selected are likely to have outcomes, had a reasonable budget and access to resources to implement. A Task Force member asked if capacity for robust data collection was a factor. Dr. Emenheiser responded yes, as a resource to tap into. Mr. Muhammad asked about the funding levels. Dr. Emenheiser responded that each

project is funded at \$400,000 per year; \$1.6 million total for each model. A follow up question was raised about whether grantees were required to demonstrate resource leverage. Dr. Emenheiser responded no, there was no matching requirement. Mr. Muhammad asked to confirm the funding level is \$400,000 for all three schools in a particular state, and Dr. Emenheiser confirmed.

Dr. Emenheiser stated the ED and DOJ collaboration is an example of interest in re-entry by the current administration. The June letter from ED and DOJ to states outlined overarching characteristics of the models. It talked about characteristics in light of what model demonstrations have identified, including a climate that prioritizes education. The letter addresses secure care settings but lessons can be applied more broadly. He noted there can be friction on the security side and on the education services side. Technology is one area that can help instruction be better. He noted often there is concern that technology is a breach of security in facilities. The second point talks about providing comparable opportunity with youth who are not system involved. 20 hours of instruction is in no way comparable. This also opens questions about co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. If we want youth to have a different outcome we need to look at ways to use energy in more pro-social ways. Many schools use sports and clubs to do that. Dr. Emenheiser stated the third point talks about qualified staff. When talking about qualified staff we need to be able to deal with the revolving door of students. Teachers have to be able to build relationships quickly, assess and diagnose very quickly and adjust their instruction. There also needs to be communication with the other teacher. The fourth point speaks to the importance of rigorous and relevant curriculum and ties into college and career readiness. Secretary Ranji stated Delaware is a common core state and juvenile justice facilities are aligning. Ms. Dietz raised a question about teacher recruitment. She stated that for some

states teachers in secure care are hired by facilities or DOE hires. Mr. Emeneheiser stated it is a mix and they are not seeing a trend in any particular direction. Many times facilities are partnering with other organizations to provide instruction. Some states' juvenile justice department are the hirers of juvenile justice teachers, but usually they are monitored in some way by DOE. The fifth point relates to formal processes and procedures, for instance record sharing and hearing officers. There are multiple ways to address this, for instance through braiding of funding. Secretary Ranji stated that one of the items she mentioned from the Promising Models document has to do with states forming MOUs and regulations to provide clarity about who is doing what and what is each department's responsibility.

Lastly, Dr. Emeneheiser spoke about future direction. US ED and DOJ are working on a resource guide that looks at better practice, which they hope will be published soon. They are also continuing to talk about what some of the expected and hoped for better practices are for education programming. He stated the Department hopes to fund another set of model demonstration projects, though he is not sure what they will look like. As of now it looks like it may not be solely focused on juveniles with disabilities. It could potentially be open to other facilities that have the broader population of youth served. Secretary Ranji asked to confirm the models he spoke about were funded by US ED and were not joint. Dr. Emeneheiser confirmed and stated the upcoming demonstration projects would be jointly funded. Dr. Emeneheiser shared his final thought, noting that earlier, more intensive interventions lead to more successes.

Secretary Ranji summarized that one of the things we keep finding is that others are struggling with same issues as Delaware. There are not easy answers. There are some good programs, but we are not yet in a place where the solution is easily accessible. It has been helpful to hear the broader perspective on what's happening elsewhere.

5. Next Steps

Secretary Ranji stated that Cara Sawyer is working on scheduling alternative school visits and we will update the group as we get dates. She also stated that at the September meeting we hope to have a roundtable with district representatives as well as a guest speaker, David Domenici from CEEAS. David is a contractor with Delaware and also helped to launch the Maya Angelou Academy. He has a good sense of what is going on in the field. An individual from the Council on State Governments (CSG) who does re-entry work may join us in October. Secretary Ranji noted we have also talked about inviting someone from SEED School in DC to learn more about the boarding school model. In addition, we have contacted ROADS School regarding charter school options. Secretary Ranji stated there are not a lot of outcomes yet, but guest speakers can talk about going down that path and describe what to think about in terms of startup. Secretary Ranji stated the other item for follow up is Delaware specific, which is the issue of credit loss and credit transfer. She stated she would brainstorm with Ms. Porter and others about what we know so that we can bring information back to the group.

Secretary Ranji asked if there was anything additional the group would like to see. A Task Force member asked if Secretary Ranji or others have talked to St. Benedicts in New Jersey. Rod Sutton and Mike Scanlon both attended there. Judge Kuhn said she could connect the Department with St. Benedicts. Secretary Ranji stated that would be helpful and noted there is a call with Milton Hershey set up.

Secretary Ranji noted there weren't any new meetings added in September. In October and November we may need to add a meeting to talk about making recommendations and to set the stage for what will be the next phase of the work. She acknowledged the issues the Task Force has been discussing are not something to solve in six months. The Task Force can make a case,

put recommendations forward and go from there. The Department will work on getting additional meetings on the calendar.

6. Public Comment

No public comment.

7. Adjournment